



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,891	08/30/2001	Michael Gary Platner	030950.0002.UTL	2086
20985	7590	12/06/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081				GOLD, AVI M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2157				

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/943,891	PLATNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Avi Gold	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the application filed August 30, 2001. Claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 1-35 represent a system for generating a web document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 12, 13, and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by D'Arlach et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,026,433.

D'Arlach teaches the invention as claimed including creating and maintaining a Web site in client-server network environments (see abstract).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 26, and 27, D'Arlach teaches a method/system for automatically/dynamically generating a web document comprising:

providing at least one prearranged web document wherein said at least one prearranged web document is capable of being displayed on a computer using a web browser (col. 5, lines 14-21, D'Arlach discloses an existing template that can be displayed by a browser in a client computer);

providing a database with preprogrammed information (col. 5, lines 1-3, D'Arlach discloses a template database);

providing a form document (col. 6, lines 25-29, D'Arlach discloses an editing form);

selecting user variables wherein said user variables are selected from said preprogrammed information using said form document (col. 6, lines 25-29, D'Arlach discloses a user selecting attributes from the form); and

automatically generating a user web document adapted for display on said computer, wherein said user web document is generated based on said desired user variables, said user web document being electronically linked to said prearranged web document (col. 6, lines 40-44, D'Arlach discloses in response to user choices a customized Web page being displayed).

Regarding claims 2 and 28, D'Arlach teaches the method/system of claims 1 and 27, wherein said at least one prearranged web document comprises a prearranged set of web documents (col. 5, lines 26-29, D'Arlach discloses a user choosing from different templates).

Regarding claim 3, D'Arlach teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said preprogrammed information comprises character sets (col. 5, lines 66-67, col. 6, lines 1-7, D'Arlach discloses customizable attributes including labels).

Regarding claims 4, 13, and 29, D'Arlach teaches the method of claims 1 and 12 and the system of claim 27, wherein said user web document is viewed by said end user over a system of networked computers, wherein the system of networked computers is the Internet, and wherein said end user is using a web browser to view said user web document (col. 6, lines 40-44, D'Arlach discloses a Web page displayed on the client computer; col. 1, lines 16-19, D'Arlach discloses a client-server network being the Internet).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 14, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach further in view of Evans, III, U.S. Patent No. 5,732,231.

D'Arlach teaches the invention substantially as claimed including creating and maintaining a Web site in client-server network environments (see abstract).

As to claims 5, 14, and 30, D'Arlach teaches the method of claims 1 and 12 and the system of claim 26.

D'Arlach fails to teach the limitation further including the user web document and the prearranged web document both relating to the funeral industry.

However, Evans teaches a monitoring apparatus for providing information concerning the life of a deceased to visitors to a funeral home (see abstract). Evans teaches the use of a PC and a display for the retrieval of information of a deceased individual (col. 2, lines 13-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach in view of Evans to use a user web document and the prearranged web document both relating to the funeral industry. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to develop personalized web documents regarding a deceased.

5. Claims 6, 8-10, 15-17, 19-21, 23, 25, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach further in view of Kobayakawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,119,078.

D'Arlach teaches the invention substantially as claimed including creating and maintaining a Web site in client-server network environments (see abstract).

As to claims 6, 15, 16, 31, and 32, D'Arlach teaches the method of claims 1 and 19 and the system of claim 26.

D'Arlach fails to teach the limitation further including selecting a language from a choice of languages for said form document, wherein said user web document is automatically generated in said language, and further wherein said language is a spoken language.

However, Kobayakawa teaches data processing systems, methods and computer program products for translating documents written in foreign languages (see abstract). Kobayakawa teaches the use of a user choosing a translation environment, automatic translation, and foreign and native languages (col. 6, lines 35-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach in view of Kobayakawa to use language translation for web documents. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for users with different native languages to view the same web document in their language.

As to claims 8, 19, 23, and 33, D'Arlach teaches the method of claim 1 and the system of claim 26.

D'Arlach fails to teach the limitation further including user variables in a first language and said user web document is generated in a second language.

However, Kobayakawa teaches the use of a user choosing a translation environment and foreign and native languages for translation (col. 6, lines 35-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach in view of Kobayakawa to use user variables in a first language and have the user web document generated in a second language.

As to claims 9, 21, and 34, D'Arlach and Kobayakawa teach the method of claims 8 and 19 and the system of claim 33.

D'Arlach fails to teach the limitation further including the first and second languages are spoken languages.

However, Kobayakawa teaches the use of foreign and native languages for translation (col. 6, lines 35-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach in view of Kobayakawa to use spoken languages.

As to claims 10, 17, 20, and 25, D'Arlach and Kobayakawa teach the method of claims 8, 12 and 19.

D'Arlach fails to teach the limitation further including automatic determination of said second language from said computer or said web browser.

However, Kobayakawa teaches the use of translating foreign language into native language; the native language being the language used by the computer (col. 9, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach in view of Kobayakawa to automatically determine said second language from said computer or said web browser.

6. Claims 7, 11, 18, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach further in view of Dan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,639.

D'Arlach teaches the invention substantially as claimed including creating and maintaining a Web site in client-server network environments (see abstract).

As to claim 7, D'Arlach teaches the method of claim 1.

D'Arlach fails to teach the limitation further including the user web document being accessible in a secure manner by a set of members.

However, Dan teaches a method and system for integrating site architecture, navigation, design, and management (see abstract). Dan teaches the use of security levels for access to a web system (col. 22, lines 6-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach in view of Dan to use a web document with security features. One would be motivated to do so because allows for only cleared members to access and change a web document.

As to claims 11, 18, and 35, D'Arlach teaches the method of claims 1 and 12 and the system of claim 26.

D'Arlach fails to teach the limitation further including the step of automatically generating a user web document comprising automatically generating a user web document using computer software programmed in PHP.

However, Dan teaches the use of a web page made in PHP (col. 27, lines 60-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach in view of Dan to use a PHP web document. One would be

motivated to do so because PHP is a known and efficient format for web document programming.

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach and Kobayakawa further in view of Evans, III, U.S. Patent No. 5,732,231.

D'Arlach teaches the invention substantially as claimed including creating and maintaining a Web site in client-server network environments (see abstract). Evans teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a monitoring apparatus for providing information concerning the life of a deceased to visitors to a funeral home (see abstract).

As to claim 22, D'Arlach and Kobayakawa teach the method of claim 19.

D'Arlach and Kobayakawa fail to teach the limitation further including the user web document and the prearranged web document both relating to the funeral industry.

However, Evans teaches the use of a PC and a display for the retrieval of information of a deceased individual (col. 2, lines 13-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach and Kobayakawa in view of Evans to use a user web document and the prearranged web document both relating to the funeral industry. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to develop personalized web documents regarding a deceased.

Art Unit: 2157

8. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach and Kobayakawa further in view of Dan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,639.

D'Arlach teaches the invention substantially as claimed including creating and maintaining a Web site in client-server network environments (see abstract). Evans teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a monitoring apparatus for providing information concerning the life of a deceased to visitors to a funeral home (see abstract).

As to claim 24, D'Arlach and Kobayakawa teach the method of claim 19.

D'Arlach and Kobayakawa fail to teach the limitation further including the step of automatically generating a user web document comprising automatically generating a user web document using computer software programmed in PHP.

However, Dan teaches a method and system for integrating site architecture, navigation, design, and management (see abstract). Dan teaches the use of a web page made in PHP (col. 27, lines 60-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify D'Arlach and Kobayakawa in view of Dan to use a PHP web document. One would be motivated to do so because PHP is a known and efficient format for web document programming.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,260,039 to Schneck et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,772 to Kantrowitz

U.S. Pat. No. 6,340,978 to Mindrum

U.S. Pat. No. 6,490,547 to Atkin et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,609,150 to Lee et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,784,562 to Diener

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Avi Gold whose telephone number is 571-272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

AMG


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100